R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 247 JC 680 024

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON TWO-YEAR COLLEGES AND THE DISADVANTAGED (STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, DELHI, JUNE 15-17, 1966).

BY- KUUSISTO, ALLAN A.
STATE UNIV. OF N.Y., ALBANY
NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPT., ALBANY

PUB DATE JUN 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.36 32P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE ROLE, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, *EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGEMENT, *STUDENT NEEDS, EDUCATIONAL NEEDS,

THREE PRINCIPLES ARE BASIC TO THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ROLE IN EDUCATING THE DISADVANTAGED--(1) THE COLLEGE MUST BE AVAILABLE TO ALL, (2) THE COLLEGE MUST MAKE A DEFINITE COMMITMENT TO EDUCATING DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS, AND (3) THE COLLEGE MUST HELP ITS ENROLLEES TO SUCCEED. DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN, REPRESENTING 15 PERCENT OF THE CHILD POPULATION, ARE (1) IN THE LOWEST INCOME GROUP, (2) DELAYED, BY FAMILY BACKGROUND, IN ADJUSTMENT TO CITY LIVING, (3) OFTEN SUBJECT TO OVERT RACIAL OR SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION, AND (4) USUALLY CHARACTERIZED BY LOW INTEREST, MOTIVATION, AND ACHIEVEMENT IN SCHOOL. DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS NEED OPPORTUNITIES WHICH THEY CAN VISUALIZE AS REAL CHANCES FOR THEM. PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS MAY EFFECTIVELY INVOLVE VARIATIONS IN ADMISSIONS PRACTICES TO INCLUDE CRITERIA OTHER THAN SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT, AND EXTENSIVE PREADMISSIONS COUNSELING. A MAJOR CRITICISM OF COLLEGE PROGRAMS CURRENTLY IN OPERATION IS THAT THEY ARE LIMITED TO AN ASSUMPTION THAT DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS REQUIRE ONLY A LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULUM. INCLUSION OF NUMBERS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN A COLLEGE OFFERS A CHALLENGE TO TEACH STUDENTS RATHER THAN TO SORT THEM. (WO)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ERIC

ED017247

COLLEGE PURPOSE AND COMMUNITY NEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK/THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION/BUREAU OF SPECIAL COLLEGE PROGRAMS
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

JC 680 024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Report of the Conference on Two-Year Colleges and the Disadvantaged

State University of New York

Agricultural and Technical College

Delhi, New York

June 15-17, 1966

JC 680 024

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF SPECIAL COLLEGE PROGRAMS

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1968 Edgar W. Couper, A.B., LL.D., L.H.D., Chancellor - - Binghamton

1967 Thad L. Collum, C.E., Vice Chancellor- - - - - - - - Syracuse

1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D.- - - - - - - Troy

1973 Charles W. Millard, Jr., A.B., LL.D. - - - - - - - - Buffalo

1970 Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S. - - - - - - - - - - White Plains

1972 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S. - - - Purchase

1975 Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D. - - - - - - - - - New York

1969 Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D. - - - New York

1977 Joseph T. King, A.B., LL.B.- - - - - - - - - - - - - Queens

1974 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - Brooklyn

1976 Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D. - - - - - - - - - Rochester

1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., LL.B. - - - - - - - - - - Glens Falls

1981 George D. Weinstein, LL.B. - - - - - - - - - - - - - Hempstead

1980 Max J. Rubin, LL.B., L.H.D.- - - - - - - - - - - - - New York

1971 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D.- - - - - - - - - New York

President of the University and Commissioner of Education
James E. Allen, Jr.

Deputy Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Associate Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education
Paul G. Bulger

Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education
Allan A. Kuusisto

Director, Division of Higher Education
Owen Albert Knorr

Chief, Bureau of Special College Programs
Leonard T. Kreisman

FOREWORD

The need and the value of drawing on the personal experience of those actively involved in running collegiate programs for disadvantaged students is amply illustrated and supported by the conclusions of the Delhi meeting for two-year college administrators and faculty sponsored by the Division of Higher Education of the New York State Education Department in June 1966. At one and the same moment, representatives of most of the two-year private colleges in New York State and of all the two-year public colleges in New York State were on hand to meet with representatives from nationally prominent programs. The results of the meeting were intended to be practical and useful in an operational sense. The sponsors feel confident that the outcomes matched the intentions.

Much has been written and said about the need for higher education to provide adequate opportunities for the disadvantaged. Very few now quarrel with this. However, the significant and functional know-how of programs remains a developing area. The Delhi meeting brought together those who were interested with those who had knowledge--firsthand practical knowledge. Peers talked to one another in language that each could understand, and the reports were honest, dealing as they did with both successes and failures and pointing out pitfalls to be avoided and cautions to be heeded in all such undertakings.

With considerable pride, the Division of Higher Education reports herewith some of the more salient considerations raised at the Delhi meeting. We believe this publication follows logically our 1965 report on Expanding Opportunity for Higher Education. The two-year colleges, and particularly the community colleges in this State, and in the nation, must serve all our citizens if we are to make significant inroads toward

extending higher education to groups not historically served by our colleges and universities.

While all participants and panelists gave fully of their time and energies, a special note of recognition of the efforts of the following should be made: Dr. Robert W. Frederick, Jr., now President of Corning Community College and formerly Consultant for Two-Year College Programs, New York State Education Department; Dr. Leonard T. Kreisman, currently Chief of the Bureau of Special College Programs, New York State Education Department; and Mr. John T. Henderson, currently the Assistant University Dean for Two-Year Colleges, State University of New York, for their roles in organizing this Conference. Dr. S. V. Martorana, State University of New York Dean for Two-Year Colleges, should be thanked for the suggestion of linking this Conference to the annual State University meeting of two-year colleges. A special word of thanks is also in order for John Reilly of the English Department, State University of New York at Albany, for his editorial assistance in compiling this report and to Miss Mary Dwyer for her untiring devotion to checking arrangements, vouchers, reservations, and her help in getting the manuscript ready for printing.

We hope that this document will serve as a solid base for those organizing and developing collegiate programs for the disadvantaged.

Allan A. Kuusisto
Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education

On June 15-17, 1966, the Division of Higher Education of the New York State Education Department, together with the University Dean for Two-Year Colleges of the State of New York, Dr. S. V. Martorana, sponsored a conference on higher education in two-year colleges for disadvantaged students. The Conference met at the State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi, and participants included administrative and admissions officers from two-year colleges of New York, professionals already involved in operating programs for disadvantaged students, and State Education Department staff.

Speaking at the opening, Dr. Allan A. Kuusisto, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, asked the conference to determine and prepare to publicize what is necessary to run a meaningful program for disadvantaged students in the two-year colleges of New York State. Dr. Kuusisto in effect asked the delegates to raise the questions about serving disadvantaged students suggested by their own experiences, and with this encouragement their meeting became a two-and-a-half-day discussion of the professional practices which could open the doors of two-year colleges to the educationally disadvantaged citizens of local communities in New York.

Basic to that discussion was the idea that readily available education for all citizens is a source of social advance, but there was also the realization that translating ideas into action is difficult. For that reason, the conference delegates set out a trio of principles, together with some applications, to serve as guidelines for policy in two-year colleges. It is in keeping with the practical outlook of the participants that the guidelines serve to open this short exposition of the "sense" of the Delhi Conference.

The First Principle

THE COLLEGE MUST BECOME AVAILABLE TO ALL

The eventual policy must be "open door admissions." Short of that, colleges may adopt a first come, first served procedure, but there is no place for academically restrictive enrollment.

The Second Principle

THE COLLEGE MUST MAKE A DEFINITE COMMITMENT TO EDUCATING

DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

In the local college this requires:

A willingness to make education relevant to the students by adjusting course sequences, instructional methods, procedural routine, admissions practices, and stated goals.

An understanding that the criterion of success is student development. For some this may mean getting started on a career, for others it may mean getting a job soon after starting college, while to many it may be transferring to a four-year college program.

In the local community this requires:

Accepting the fact that "open door admissions" implies vigorous recruiting.

Working closely with high schools and local social agencies, and using a public information program to announce the opportunities available for disadvantaged students in the college.

Having the confidence to use subjective and unconventional means of discovering student potential.

In the professional community this requires:

Strong efforts to recruit as teachers people who care about education of disadvantaged students, including people from disadvantaged backgrounds themselves, and people who know well what the community role of two-year colleges is.

Communication of ideas and programs for educating disadvantaged students by means of regional meetings with staff from other schools, consultants from operating programs, and State Education Department resources of information and consultation.

The Third Principle

THE COLLEGE MUST HELP THOSE IT ENROLLS TO SUCCEED

Students with inadequate academic background require compensatory training to prepare them to do college work.

Disadvantaged students must be supported emotionally and socially with an intensive counseling program and strong guidance. Every effort must be made to help students adjust to the world of college without leading them to reject their home environment.

Placement services must become a regular part of the college program for all students whenever they need them.

For many schools these guidelines could lead to changes, but none of these would be out of place. The Standards for Two-Year Community Colleges Under the Program of the State University of New York, published in 1965, codifies the role the public two-year colleges, and many of the private colleges also, have been expected to play. The Standards . . . specifically calls for open door admissions, fully developed guidance services, a comprehensive curriculum, and public relations efforts. Moreover, in stating that "community colleges are encouraged to experiment with curricular and instructional innovations" The Standards . . . officially recognizes that the two-year colleges must rely on their own accumulating experience and must innovate to serve their unique purpose.

The rest of this booklet sums up the thinking behind the guidelines in terms of the questions and answers about student need and college response which brought about the conference discussion.

WHY IS HIGHER EDUCATION BECOMING A NECESSITY FOR SO MANY PEOPLE?

Perhaps nobody needs to be told that the demand is great for technically trained workers to keep pace with the development of our economy. And surely everybody has heard there are many people today who are unemployable in our complex industries and businesses because they do not have enough education. Still, most people have not thought seriously enough about these two conditions to recognize the connection between them - the fact that what might have been sufficient education thirty years ago is insufficient now. It should be commonly understood that to participate fully in our changing society a person must add a high degree of acquired skill to his native ability. It might be reassuring to think that somehow or other something will turn up for people who really want to work, as it seems to have done in the familiar success stories of the past. It might be inspiring to think that people will continue to work themselves up from unskilled jobs to semi-skilled ones and higher. Truthfully, though, it is doubtful if fate was ever so beneficent, and we cannot afford the luxury of believing it is now so, because every individual's education or lack of it has social importance. Too many Americans today face adult responsibilities and the world of work at a disadvantage because they lack technical skills and have no possibility of gaining them unless somehow education intervenes in their

lives. This is the way Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz puts it:

> We simply cannot any longer afford to let boys and girls leave the education system unprepared to use their minds as well as their muscles. We must, in one way or another, see to it that they have what today's - and tomorrow's - labor market requires.

Some economists calculate that twenty percent of the national growth rate is the result of increased efficiency gained by individual workers. Less easily measured but also certain are the results in the community of stability and creativity among well educated individuals. Certainly individuals ought to view their education as self-development. Educators, however, must see as axiomatic that in learning: <u>what benefits one, benefits all</u>!

<u>DOES THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE HAVE A SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY</u>?

With the accelerating demand for advanced education, one institution will have a major responsibility to provide a comprehensive range of opportunities, since that institution's "dominant feature is its intimate relations to the life of the community it serves." These words were used to describe the two-year or community college in <u>Higher Education for American Democracy</u>, the 1947 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. The report became famous for stating the role of the two-year college:

> Whatever form the community college takes, its purpose is educational service to the entire community, and this purpose requires of it a variety of functions and programs. It will provide college education for the youth of the community certainly, so as to remove geographic and economic barriers to educational opportunities and discover and develop individual talents at low cost and easy access. But, in addition, the community college will serve as an active center of adult education. It will attempt to meet the total post-high school needs of its community. (Vol. I, p. 67)

Since 1947 the role anticipated for the community college has become the expected and actual role. Community colleges have tried to identify themselves as learning centers for their entire communities and have taken as their task finding and meeting the needs of the local community. Educating our disadvantaged citizens, then, will mean simply that two-year colleges will attempt to meet the total post-high school needs of their communities.

As the colleges announce their "open admissions" policies, a number of students will be motivated to seek advanced education. For many, many people, though, the news that applications are accepted at the local college will not be enough. Some people will be unable to pay even moderate fees, and still more will be unprepared either academically or emotionally to seek higher education, even though they could use it. They are in the trap of disadvantage, for, broadly defined, a disadvantaged person is one who is undertrained and underprepared to participate fully in society and is not able to remedy his deficiency.

WHAT SHOULD EDUCATORS KNOW ABOUT THE DISADVANTAGED?

Disadvantage is a relative term. The poor in the United States are better off than the poor in Asia, but they remain worse off than the affluent in their own country. The liability of poverty status is that a person does not share in the abundance available to some people, and, what is more, as time goes on, he has less and less chance of sharing in it, if he must rely only on his undeveloped personal and family resources. Occupations are more and more frequently tied to education, and social status is more and more closely linked with occupation, but the

disadvantaged are simply not free to move in that sequence.

Much has been written to describe children who are disadvantaged. Statistically, they are said to represent fifteen percent of the child population and as many as thirty percent of the young people in large cities. Socially and economically, they belong to the lowest income group in our nation. Often they have a family background that delays their adjustment to city living or limits their experience so that by such objective measures as "grade level" tests they fall behind other students. Most of the disadvantaged children also have the burden of experiencing overt racial or social discrimination.

The educational characteristics of disadvantaged students are also familiar in research literature. For example, the disadvantaged child generally performs inadequately in verbal and symbolic work and consequently is classified as a low achiever very early in his schooling. He may also display a low level of interest in traditional culture compared to children from middle-income groups, and the lack of interest combined with low academic achievement makes him appear to some people as "dull."

As the comparison of the poor of Asia and the poor of the United States shows, however, people are disadvantaged according to the context in which they live. Disadvantaged does not mean inferior. In a big city slum a youngster may be the leader of a neighborhood group, but in a conventionally organized college classroom he may fail because he is not prepared to deal with the academic subject or because he is alone among students who appear very different from him. The youngster will be at a

disadvantage in comparison to his college classmates, but he will not be inferior or incapable. He can be helped to feel comfortable in the classroom, and he can be helped belatedly to assimilate the background he needs.

Americans are proud of surviving differences from their national backgrounds. St. Patrick's Day and Columbus Day attest to it. It is important that differences among other sub-cultural groups such as the urban Negro, the Puerto Rican, or the Southern white also become acceptable. What it amounts to is that, depending on their backgrounds, people are prepared differently for living. Meeting different challenges people come to think differently and to hold different values. If the challenges of some people's lives do not include technology or the need for abstract thinking, they may be at a disadvantage, but it can be overcome, and should be as far as possible without totally destroying the individual's inherited culture.

The question of who are the disadvantaged was thoroughly discussed at Delhi because the participants agreed that it was essential to recognize that class derived values often influence educators' as well as laymen's attitudes toward students. With the best of intentions educators may set out to remake students in the image of their middle class selves, and if students resist, the teachers may be disappointed or defensive.

At the same time, the educators at Delhi agreed that programs for disadvantaged students must above all be realistic. Programs must be established in the understanding that the disadvantaged students are <u>not</u> people who have excellent academic records, high motivations and merely

lack finances. The disadvantaged student is not only short of the training that he can acquire through formal instruction, he also may lack the motivation to acquire it. There are various causes of his apathy. For example, the student may recognize that even educated people can suffer painful racial discrimination, or he may have so much to do just to survive in his environment that he cannot imagine doing more than what is immediately necessary. Perhaps the most common cause of apathy is that a student is so insulated by his poor academic record and his environment that he does not know the opportunities available to him. Whatever the cause, a disadvantaged student ordinarily does not seem to aspire to higher education.

It is not surprising, then, that disadvantaged students with mediocre or worse academic records and a less than enthusiastic faith in education will score low even if they take admissions tests. They will not stand high on other conventional measures either. Again the causes are various. A student who is in poverty or a member of a minority ethnic group may feel second class in school and be discouraged from full participation in school activities, unless he is a natural athlete. A student whose background does not provide him models of formal verbal usage may find school English alien and not develop verbal skills for exam taking. On the other hand, the assets of disadvantaged youngsters are seldom revealed in conventional tests and interviews. A disadvantaged youngster's undesirable neighborhood environment may also be the place where he develops earlier than other children his survival ability, or his leadership skill and courage, expressed in ad hoc neighborhood groups instead of formal organizations. Disadvantaged children derive their knowledge largely outside

the school and away from middle class settings, and as yet there are not useful instruments to measure that sort of learning or the ability it indicates. As a result, colleges must face the fact that disadvantaged students will appear to be high risks academically when they are measured by conventional indices.

HOW SHALL COLLEGES BEGIN TO EDUCATE DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS?

The only practical recourse is for colleges to take the risks, to deliberately seek to enroll disadvantaged students, and to provide them the encouragement and support they need to succeed.

Mr. Ira Contente of the Department of Educational Sociology and the Center for Human Relations of New York University suggested in a speech to the Delhi Conference that the first step in recruiting disadvantaged students is to help them discover that higher education is instrumental, that it can be the means to relevant goals. All the people who have been disadvantaged by social or racial discrimination, poverty or isolation know that they are commonly considered second class citizens. Their awareness of this secondary position reinforces the failure they meet in conventional schooling and makes them feel education is futile. Programs for disadvantaged students must contend with this feeling of futility. If students living in the poverty of a city slum are approached by college recruiters and told the college will make them teachers, or doctors, or lawyers, or give them the chance to become President, what is their reaction going to be? "Quit putting me on!" they'll say. Similarly, if approached with programs built exclusively on high powered cultural

offerings, disadvantaged students, knowing how alien the culture is to them, may have to defend themselves against it - by rejecting it.

Given this situation, Mr. Contente said, disadvantaged students first must be shown possibilities that they can visualize at that time as real chances for them. This means students can be told how they will be able to qualify for an occupation they know about, such as skilled production work, social service assistantships, etc. With a useful job as a goal the student will be able to respond favorably to the idea of further education since a job promises economic reward and social status, and if he can train for the job within a year or two, it will seem a realistic goal.

Once a student has become involved in higher education he is on a career line. After he qualifies for the job he first chooses, he may find that there are more complex jobs he can qualify for with a little more training. Achieving competence and success with one educational choice, a student will be more likely to choose more training. Perhaps he won't proceed uninterrupted along the career line, but there is a lifetime for education, once a student has started and determined for himself the value of higher education.

WHAT MODELS ARE THERE FOR PROGRAMS TO REACH DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS?

The Delhi Conference discussed in detail five programs for aiding disadvantaged students: the Antioch Program for Interracial Education, the Princeton Cooperative School Program, Upward Bound, the College Discovery Program of the City University of New York, and the Open

Enrollment policy planned for the State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Canton. As a result of the differences among these institutions, each of the programs has its own character; yet, each also has qualities applicable elsewhere.

Antioch

Innovations in Admissions Practice

The Antioch College program for disadvantaged students is marked by significant departures from the usual methods of recruiting students. To find a number of disadvantaged students to attend this small liberal arts college set in rural Ohio, the staff established selector groups in large cities including New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and Philadelphia. The selector groups are composed of individuals who live in and around disadvantaged areas and know students through social agencies, churches, and settlement houses. According to Sue Alexander of the East Harlem Protestant Parish, who serves as a selector and explained the program to the Conference, Antioch told the selector groups that the College will accept students on their recommendation alone.

The criteria used by the selectors are personal qualities of the students, as they judge them. No effort is made to contact guidance officers in the schools. The selectors look for courage in students, a willingness to change and a realistic understanding of what change will involve. They are interested in students who are intellectually and emotionally accessible; in other words, they seek students who are free in mind if not in circumstances. Using such criteria the selectors find there is no shortage of potential students.

During and after selection, Antioch has found the relationships with students must be intensely personal. To this end, the College establishes bridges between the students' home environments and school by providing faculty members as counselors and by arranging for remedial tutorial work.

The Antioch program was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1964. Initially it has worked with Negro students. In the fall of 1965, eleven students discovered through the program were admitted to Antioch. For future admissions the college began conferring with thirty or forty more students. The project is small and will probably remain so, as the college itself is a small institution oriented toward very personal education. The program has been successful enough though to convince the Antioch staff that there must be many more innovations to accommodate disadvantaged students. Conventional admission standards would have excluded the students recruited by the selector groups.

Princeton

Extensive Pre-Admissions Counseling

The distinction of Princeton University's Cooperative Schools Program is its intention to show students that educators care about their futures and will help them acquire the skills needed for success in college. Through alumni and teachers the University has begun looking for students whom Carl Fields, Assistant Financial Aids Officer, described for the Delhi Conference as "frustrated underachievers."

These are youngsters who might be capable of college work but who have become discouraged about themselves and have not performed at expected grade level.

To start the program, forty students were brought to Princeton in the summer of their tenth grade year for six weeks of instruction in study skills and for remedial counseling. In the continuing program, after the initial summer on the Princeton campus, students are contacted each month at home or school, and their parents also participate in the interviews. In the summer of their eleventh grade year the students are again put into a six week program, but this time they are sent to a preparatory school where the experience is more formalized. During the twelfth grade, students meet regularly with counselors to plan their future education. Counselors do not necessarily recruit students into Princeton, but admissions standards are made flexible for them.

Upward Bound

Federal Commitment to Recruiting Disadvantaged Students

For the 1966 fiscal year 223 Upward Bound projects were funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Sixteen of those programs were in New York State.

Students are chosen in the tenth and eleventh grade for Upward Bound on the basis of having met the poverty income criterion of the Office of Economic Opportunity, having shown potentiality for college work by subjective measurement, and possessing academic records that would preclude their admission to college on a conventional basis. Students spend eight weeks on a college campus during the summer. They do no remedial work, but instead there may be instruction in art, seminars on current issues, cultural trips, free wheeling discussions - all with the purpose of showing students that learning can be personally relevant and satisfying to them.

Since encouragement and emotional support to disadvantaged students are the purposes of Upward Bound, intensive follow-up is planned after the summer residence to reinforce the students' developing motivation through tutoring, weekend meetings, and other means.

Sarah Holden of the Upward Bound Office stressed to the Delhi Conference that the special significance of Upward Bound is that it can provide funds at many colleges to start programs for disadvantaged students.

The College Discovery Program

The Largest, Most Comprehensive Program Now Operating

Rachel Wilkinson of the Bronx Community College described this program to the Conference as a permanently operating and steadily expanding part of the City University. Since its inception in 1964, the program has been extended to five community colleges in New York City, and for the academic year 1965-66 the number of students chosen for the program reached 630.

Students are nominated by counselors and principals. Their records would not permit them regular admission to the City University, so they are provided remedial work in the summer before enrollment and subsequently given intensive counseling and tutoring. Study schedules for Discovery students are flexible. They may take three years to complete a two year program, but with all the special attention given them the students are not set off in special sections or classes, nor are they identified as unusual students to the faculty.

All the students enroll in a program toward a B.A. and look ahead to

transferring to one of the borough colleges of the City University when they complete their community college work.

The distinction of this program is that it is the effort of a large public institution to make the process of education of disadvantaged students - with all that requires in terms of recruiting, counseling, and compensatory training - a significant part of the regular operation of the two-year college. This achievement is, at present, unique.

Canton Tech

A Program for the Disadvantaged Students in Rural Areas

In the familiar image the disadvantaged neighborhoods appear as the special financial and social burden of our large cities, so it comes as a surprise to find out that St. Lawrence County, which is one of the most rural counties in New York, has the highest per capita welfare expenditure in the State. It is clear to President Albert E. French of the Canton Agricultural and Technical Institute that his school has a special responsibility to attempt to remedy the extensive disadvantage shown by the welfare statistics. Under President French's leadership, therefore, Canton Tech will make it a matter of actual practice to provide higher education to all high school graduates in the county in the amount and at the time they need it.

To accomplish this purpose President French told the Delhi Conference his institution is willing to make many adjustments. For example, a student may enroll in a program which is occupational in character, while at the same time he takes courses that will allow him to return to school in the future to study for a B.A. or B.S. if he

desires. Thus, Canton will ease movement on the student's career line. Since finances are a barrier to disadvantaged students, Canton Tech has guaranteed that the expenses of any high school graduate will be met by the college if necessary. To make sure this fact is known the admissions office conducts a vigorous publicity program which includes visits with the local welfare administrators to ask that they look for prospective students among their clients.

The outstanding characteristic of the proposed Canton policy is that it takes the idea of open-door admissions literally. Moreover, to be sure the open door does not become a revolving door, Canton Tech assumes the responsibility to provide counseling and compensatory support for students as they need it and job placement not only for graduates but also for dropouts.

AN IMPORTANT CRITICISM

In discussion, the conferees at Delhi saw the virtue of all these model programs to be their willingness to depart from convention, especially regarding the recruiting and admission of students. It was ironic, though, that their strongest criticism was that in one important way existing programs are still conventional; that is, in their assumption of what makes a meaningful education. Nearly all the existing programs are limited because they assume disadvantaged students require only a liberal arts curriculum. At the present time, for example, the source of funds available through Upward Bound is restricted to

> Any accredited two-year college, public or private, which offers a liberal arts preparatory program and

has the capability of providing residential facilities for the summer phase of a full year UPWARD BOUND project.

Counselors believe this is a limitation because they feel that what the disadvantaged students desire above all is a definite and meaningful role in society, and they see this concretely as a job. Once they have a job as their goal, students may find the study of values and cultural and historical subjects attractive. For administrators in comprehensive community colleges where much of their effort goes, an emphasis on liberal arts for disadvantaged students seems limiting, because they feel disadvantaged students should be introduced to their entire curriculum.

The discussion at Delhi focused on means of getting disadvantaged students into the educational sequence and making them aware of the possibilities of education in their personal growth. They rejected the idea that a student is limited by his background or origin to any type of occupation, and in the same spirit they strenuously criticized any suggestions of curricular limitation.

WHAT WILL THE DISADVANTAGED CONTRIBUTE TO THE COLLEGE?

In a speech on the final evening of the Delhi Conference, Dr. Lawrence Howard, Director of the Institute of Human Relations at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee spoke of what the disadvantaged can do for the colleges. Normally we stress the service that the colleges provide to students, and especially in regard to disadvantaged students we concentrate on how individuals will benefit as they develop their latent talents, forgetting meanwhile that the college is a collective

body of faculty and staff and students in which each group contributes to defining the whole. Inevitably as the student group comes to include more of the disadvantaged citizens of our communities they will have a significant influence on the nature of the college.

How will the disadvantaged students influence the two-year colleges? For one thing, the presence of large numbers of disadvantaged students in the classroom will offer a challenge to teach rather than sort students. Surely this is a consequence all will welcome. Another outcome will be the opportunity for the colleges to relate their institutional research directly to a population that needs educational action. But above all, it was Dr. Howard's point that the two-year colleges will rediscover their unique purpose when they accept responsibility to offer higher education to the disadvantaged, because they, more effectively than any other institution, will be applying the fundamental doctrine of democratic educational philosophy - education relevant to all.

A STATE-WIDE MOVEMENT

Each two-year college has some special characteristics depending upon its location, the population it serves, and the type of local support it receives. In meeting the challenges represented by these characteristics each college also has special achievements. Yet, since the purposes of the colleges are the same, each can help, and in return benefit from others.

The Delhi Conference started a network of communication by which two-year colleges can share ideas and proposals for educating disadvantaged

students. Additional brief meetings on a regional basis, or perhaps a newsletter are ways colleges can maintain communication. A way of stimulating the development of other practical ideas in local contexts would be to have consultants from operating programs visit colleges for a day and speak with the faculty and staff who are interested in the programs for the disadvantaged.

Whether these suggestions or others are the most useful means to sustain a state-wide movement toward higher education for disadvantaged students, the New York State Education Department wants to see the movement grow. To that tend, the Department promises encouragement and aid to local colleges in expanding their present programs and especially in developing new proposals to merit support by foundations or the agencies of the State and Federal governments.

The educators who met at Delhi did not have to be persuaded that it is important to offer higher education to our disadvantaged citizens. They attended the meeting with the intention of finding ways of making education available to everyone, because they know that by providing a chance for disadvantaged individuals to fulfill their human potential they will humanize their communities and that no greater justification is needed. The only appropriate conclusion to the report of such a meeting is a restatement of the principles enunciated in the Conference guidelines, with the reminder that they are <u>a guide to action</u>:

<u>THE COLLEGE MUST BECOME AVAILABLE TO ALL</u>

<u>THE COLLEGE MUST MAKE A DEFINITE COMMITMENT TO EDUCATING DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS</u>

<u>THE COLLEGE MUST HELP THOSE IT ENROLLS TO SUCCEED</u>

Appendix A

ROSTER OF PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES AND THE DISADVANTAGED CONFERENCE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
AGRICULTURAL & TECHNICAL COLLEGE AT DELHI
June 14-17, 1966

Sue Alexander	Consultant, Antioch College
Leonard J. Barrett	Dean of Student Personnel Services, Westchester C.C.
Mary L. Baynes	Guidance Counselor, Monroe C.C.
Donald J. Beck	Dean of Men, Corning C.C.
George L. Berner	Director of Admissions, SUNY, ATC at Cobleskill
Norman F. Bourke	Dean, Auburn C.C.
Gerard R. Brophy	Director of Counseling Services, Mohawk Valley C.C.
Paul L. Brown	Director of Admissions, Onondaga C.C.
Charles A. Brox	Counselor, Jefferson C.C.
George W. Brush	Dean of Student Affairs, Academy of Aeronautics
Marion M. Calvert	Student Personnel Counselor, Jamestown C.C.
Robert Carpenter	Asst. Dean of Students, SUNY, ATC at Morrisville
Alden Chadwick	Asst. Dean of Students, SUNY, ATC at Canton
Paul A. Chambers	Dean of Students, Broome Technical C.C.
James L. Clugstone	Director of Admissions, Adirondack C.C.
Lee Cohen	Dean of Students, Borough of Manhattan C.C.
Woolf Colvin	Coordinator, Kingsborough C.C.
John Connolly	Director of Admissions, Sullivan County C.C.
Ira Contente	Consultant, New York University
Rev. F.V. Courneen	Chairman, Dept. of Philosophy, Canisius College
Donald G. Crout	Dean of Students, Ulster County C.C.
Raymond Dansereau	Dir. of Counseling & Testing, Hudson Valley C.C.
Daniel De Ponte	Dir. of Financial Aid, Suffolk County C.C.
Vivian Dreer	Counselor, New York City C.C.
Sister Mary Eloise	Dean, Maria Regina College
Judith Emmanuel	Admissions Counselor, Monroe C.C.
Sister Mary Ernestine	Student Adviser, Sancta Maria College
William T. Eveleth	Registrar-Counselor, Adirondack C.C.
Carl Fields	Consultant, Princeton University
Peter Fishell	Counselor, Hudson Valley C.C.
Robert W. Frederick, Jr.	Consultant, N.Y.S. Education Department
Jane Freeman	Director, Student Personnel, Rockland C.C.
Albert E. French	Consultant, SUNY, ATC at Canton
T. David Foxworthy	Asst. to the Dean of Instruction, Mohawk Valley C.C
James A. Gallagher	Admissions Officer & Registrar, Jamestown C.C.
John F. Gardephe	Dir. of Placement, SUNY, ATC at Cobleskill
Larry Genco	Counselor, Staten Island C.C.
Sister Mary Geraldine	Dean, Maria College of Albany
Donald H. Gibbs	Dir. of Admissions, SUNY, ATC at Alfred
Howard Greene	Consultant, Princeton University
Richard F. Grego	Dean, Sullivan County C.C.
Donald D. Gullone	Counselor, SUNY, ATC at Alfred
Walter Hannahs	Associate, N.Y.S. Education Department
Allen V. Hanson	Dir. of Admissions & Registrar, Orange County C.C.
James J. Hohensee	Dean of Students, Erie County Technical Institute
Sarah Holden	Consultant, Office of Economic Opportunity
Charles Holland	Dir. of Admissions, SUNY, ATC at Canton

Lawrence Howard	Consultant, University of Wisconsin
Albert Iorio	Dean of Students, SUNY, ATC at Cobleskill
Isabelle C. Jackson	Student Personnel Counselor, Jamestown C.C.
Theron A. Johnson	Administrator, N.Y.S. Education Department
Sister Mary Josephine	Academic Dean, Villa Maria College of Buffalo
Portor Kirkwood	Coordinator, Nassau C.C.
Leonard T. Kreisman	Associate, N.Y.S. Education Department
Dorothy Knoell	Consultant, State University Central Staff
Owen Albert Knorr	Director, N.Y.S. Education Department
Edwin D. Kurlander	Dean of Students, Sullivan County C.C.
Allan A. Kuusisto	Asst. Comm. for Higher Ed., N.Y.S. Ed. Dept.
Therese Kuzlik	Asst. Dean, SUNY, ATC at Alfred
Seymour Lachman	Asst. Prof. of History, Kingsborough C.C.
Paul E. Lindh	Dean, Adirondack C.C.
Gustave Manasee	College Psychologist, Borough of Manhattan C.C.
Sister Gerard Marie	Dean of Students, Queen of the Apostles College
Henry Marx	Dir. of Admissions, Suffolk County C.C.
Edward Maurer	Counselor, New York City C.C.
Morris Meister	Consultant, Bronx C.C.
George O. Metzler	Dean of Men, SUNY, ATC at Morrisville
Julian E. Miranda	Field Representative, N.Y.S. Education Department
Carl Mitlenner	Dir. of Admissions, SUNY, ATC at Farmingdale
Walter Mondschein	Asst. Dean, Sullivan County C.C.
Catherine Mulligan	Asst. Dean of Students, SUNY, ATC at Farmingdale
Ralph H. O'Brien	Dean, Hudson Valley C.C.
Eugene O'Neill	Chairman, Div. of Gen. Ed., SUNY, ATC at Farmingdale
Stanley B. Patterson	Acting Dean of Students, SUNY, ATC at Morrisville
Gary Pecorella	Counselor, Staten Island C.C.
John Petrelli	Acting Dean of Students, Kingsborough C.C.
James D. Pletcher	Division Chairman, Liberal Arts, Niagara County C.C.
Richard Powers	Dir. of Admissions, Broome Technical C.C.
Maurice Purcell	Dir. of Admissions, Borough of Manhattan C.C.
Robert H. Reynolds	Dean, Westchester C.C.
William A. Robbins	Dean of Students, Mohawk Valley C.C.
Sister Mary Rosalie	President, Maria Regina College
Marc S. Salisch	Dean of Students, Fulton Montgomery C.C.
Roy I. Satre, Jr.	Dean, Niagara County C.C.
Peter Scarth	Consultant, Inst. for Services to Ed. Discussion
Harold O. Schaffer	Dir. of Admissions, Fashion Institute of Technology
Charles A. Schenck	Counselor, Ulster County C.C.
Walter T. Schoen, Jr.	Dean, Rockland Community College
William H. Schwab	Dir. of Student Personnel, Auburn C.C.
Albert Selinger	Acting Dean of Students, New York City C.C.
Paula Shaer	Admissions Counselor, SUNY, ATC at Farmingdale
Norman Shea	Dir. - Admissions, Niagara County C.C.
George F. Shepard	Dean of Students, Orange County C.C.
Irving L. Slade	Project Coordinator, City University of New York
Leonard B. Smith	Dean of Student Personnel Services, Monroe C.C.
John Speirs	Dean of Students, Suffolk C.C.
Orman Spivey	Counseling Services, Orange County C.C.

Clement M. Thompson	Dean of Students, Bronx C.C.
Rachel D. Wilkinson	Consultant, Bronx C.C.
Frances L. Wolfe	Asst. Registrar, Staten Island C.C.
Glenn E. Wright	Dean, SUNY ATC at Canton
Milo E. Van Hall	Dean, SUNY ATC at Alfred
Stephen Zalewski	Financial Aid Officer, Niagara County C.C.

Appendix B

TWO YEAR COLLEGES AND THE DISADVANTAGED
PROGRAM SCHEDULE

June 14, 1966

6:00 p.m.	Registration
8:00-10:00 p.m.	Coffee and Cake Snack Bar

June 15, 1966

7:00-8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00-10:15 a.m. Farrell Hall Little Theatre	Who Are the Disadvantaged? Speaker: Mr. Ira Contente, Center for Human Relations, New York University, Department of Educational Sociology
10:15-10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break
10:30-11:45 a.m.	Discussion
12:00- 1:15 p.m.	Lunch
1:30- 3:15 p.m. Farrell Hall Little Theatre	Getting Started on Programs for the Disadvantaged Speaker: Dr. Morris Meister, President, Bronx Community College
3:15- 3:30 p.m.	Coffee Break
3:30- 4:30 p.m.	Open Discussion
5:30- 6:00 p.m.	Social Hour
6:00- 7:15 p.m.	Dinner
Evening	Films and free for development of individual programs

June 16, 1966

7:00- 8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00-10:15 a.m.	Ongoing Programs: Antioch College--Speaker: Sue Alexander, East Harlem Protestant Parish, New York City. Selector: Antioch Program

June 16, 1966

Farrell Hall Little Theatre	Princeton University--Speaker: Carl Fields, Assistant Financial Aids Officer, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey College Discovery Program--Speaker: Rachel Wilkinson, Associate Professor, Bronx Community College, Bronx, New York State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College at Canton, Albert E. French, President Upward Bound--Speakers: Sarah Holden, Upward Bound, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C., and Peter Scarth, Institute for Services to Education, Washington, D. C.
10:15-10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break
10:30-11:45 a.m.	Continuation
12:00- 1:15	Lunch
1:30- 3:15 p.m.	Small Group Meetings
Sanford Hall Room 120-123	I. Financial Assistance--Resource Person: Walter Hannahs, State Education Department and the University of Rochester
Sanford Hall Room 116-119	II. Recruiting--Resource Person: Sue Alexander, East Harlem Protestant Parish
Sanford Hall Room 1	III. Admissions--Resource Person: Howard Greene, Princeton University
Smith Hall Room 106-107	IV. Guidance and Counseling--Resource Person: Rachel Wilkinson, Bronx Community College
3:15- 3:30 p.m.	Coffee Break
3:30- 5:00 p.m.	Continuation of small group meetings
5:30- 6:00 p.m.	Social Hour
6:00- 7:15 p.m.	Dinner

June 16, 1966

7:15 p.m.	What the disadvantaged can do for your college. Speaker: Dr. Lawrence Howard, Director, Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin Comments: Dr. Dorothy Knoell, State University Central Staff with special reference to New York State

June 17, 1966

7:00- 8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00-10:15 a.m. Farrell Hall Little Theatre	Summary
10:15-10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break
10:30-11:30 a.m.	Evaluation
Noon	Lunch and Departure

Appendix C

THE COLLEGE COMMITTEE ON THE DISADVANTAGED -- MEMBERSHIP

* Dr. Anna Burrell
State University of New York
College at Buffalo
1300 Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14222

Mr. Charles J. Calitri
Director
Programs for the Disadvantaged
Hofstra University
Hempstead, L.I., New York

Dr. G. Bruce Dearing
President
State University of New York
at Binghamton
Vestal Parkway
East Binghamton, New York 13901

Dr. George E. Fitch
Supervising Principal
Greenburgh School District #8
Board of Education
475 West Hartsdale Avenue
Warburg Campus
Hartsdale, New York

* Dr. Buell G. Gallagher
President
City College of the
City University of New York
Convent Avenue at 138 Street
New York, New York 10031

Mr. Arnold L. Goren
Dean of Admissions
New York University
100 Washington Square East
New York, New York 10003

Mr. Candido de Leon
Assistant to the Chancellor
City University of New York
535 East 80th Street
New York, New York 10021

* Reverend James J. McGinley, S.J.
Provincial's Residence
420 Demong Drive
Syracuse, New York 13214

Mr. Owen F. Peagler
Education Coordinator
Office of Economic Opportunity
509 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

* Mr. Richard Plaut
NSSFNS
6 East 82nd Street
New York, New York 10028

Dr. Frederick H. Williams
Director
Human Relations Unit
Board of Education of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Mr. Lester Ingalls
ACUSNY
100 State Street
Albany, New York

* Continuing Members